

1
2
3

4 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5
6
7

8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9
10
11

FETCH MEDIA, LTD.,

12 Plaintiff,

No. C 18-00015 WHA

13 v.

14 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

15 Defendant.

16 **ORDER DENYING
17 ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
18 FILE UNDER SEAL**

19
20
21

22 Our analysis begins with a “strong presumption” in favor of access to court records. *Foltz*
23 *v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003).

24
25
26
27
28

When the “good cause” standard applies there must be a “particularized showing” that specific
harm or prejudice will result if the information is disclosed. *Kamakana v. City & County of
Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179–80 (9th Cir. 2006). Furthermore, Civil Local Rule 79-5(b)
requires administrative motions to file under seal to “be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of
sealable material.” Here, no good cause has been shown to seal all of Exhibits A through F to the
complaint. Accordingly, plaintiff’s overbroad sealing motion is **DENIED**.

29
30
31
32
33

Plaintiff may file a renewed administrative motion to file under seal by **JULY 2 AT NOON**.

If the renewed motion is not narrowly tailored, it will be denied in its entirety.

34
35
36

IT IS SO ORDERED.

37
38
39
40
41

Dated: June 27, 2018.


WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE